

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2565990 to Richard et al. (the “Richard Patent”) for the reasons cited in the office action.

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the method being used without the use of rudder control.

Applicant has attached a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 with an attached detail aerodynamic analysis as evidence showing that the assumptions made by the Examiner are incorrect and that the end plates of the Richard Patent can only produce an induced drag differential that creates additional adverse yaw, rather than overcoming it. This in combination with the fact that, nowhere is it taught or even suggested in the Richard Patent to use “Induced Drag” to control an aircraft in a turn, as claimed in claim 1, the applicant believes that the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 are not valid and 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 as amended are not anticipated by the Richard Patent.

In view of the aforementioned remarks and amendments, it is believed that claims 1-17 are in condition for allowance and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Elnitski, Jr./
John J. Elnitski, Jr.
Registration No. 39,968

225 A Snowbird Lane
Bellefonte, PA 16823
(814) 355-7646